



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,415	11/21/2000	Akihisa Kenmochi	14090	6487
23389	7590	02/08/2005	EXAMINER	
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			DENNISON, JERRY B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/717,415

Applicant(s)

KENMOCHI, AKIHISA

Examiner

J. Bret Dennison

Art Unit

2143

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,2 and 5-16.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
see Attached.
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
 13. Other: _____.

William C. Vaughn
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit 2143
 William C. Vaughn, Jr.

Priority

1. Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority
2. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims is 11/25/1999, however any subject mater defined in the claims not previously priority # 11-334621 is entitled to the effective filing date of 11/21/2000.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: Because claims 3 and 4 have been canceled, claims 7 and 8 must be corrected since they depend on claims 3 and 4. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Amendment

4. Regarding independent claim 1, Applicant's arguments include the failure of previously applied art to disclose a contents database that maintains information about content stored in devices of the network [see Applicant's Response, filed 09, December 2004, page 8 of 12]. It is evident from the detailed mappings found in the final rejection [dated 05 October 2004] that Sims et al. (U.S. 5,434,775) discloses the teachings of a data management computer that maintains an inventory database for all devices including contents which identify location, condition, and type of each device as well as other information (Sims, col. 13, lines 5-20).

5. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 3, "wherein said network monitoring unit detects a power on/off status of the apparatuses connected to the network, and retains in the contents database information of the power on/off status of the apparatuses connected to the network".

Art Unit: 2143

6. Applicant acknowledges that Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0035620) discloses a control apparatus that reads control information stored in peripheral devices and determines whether a power source of the peripheral device is on or off [see Applicants Response, filed 09 December 2004].

7. The combination of Sims and Takahashi does teach "wherein said network monitoring unit detects a power on/off status of the apparatuses connected to the network, and retains in the contents database information of the power on/off status of the apparatuses connected to the network".

8. Combining the contents database of Williams and the network monitoring of Hasegawa with the power on/off detection of Takahashi would improve the centralized storage management by monitoring the devices of the system for connections including control over power management of devices. Therefore the combination of Williams, Hasegawa, and Takahashi, discloses the claimed invention.